



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/633,806	08/07/2000	Sameh W. Asaad	YOR9-2000-0175	3370

21254 7590 07/03/2003

MCGINN & GIBB, PLLC  
8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD  
SUITE 200  
VIENNA, VA 22182-3817

EXAMINER
----------

DINH, DUC Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2674

13

DATE MAILED: 07/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/633,806

Applicant(s)

ASAAD ET AL.

Examiner

DUC Q DINH

Art Unit

2674

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6-14 and 19-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6-14 and 19-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                      4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                      5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_                      6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on March 31, 2003 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 9-13 are vague with regard to the recited apparatus. Specially, the recited the limitation "a display unit"; it is not clear that it is used to indicate the same object or different objects in the claims (see claim 9).

### ***Claim Objections***

4. Claims 22 and 23 are objected to because of the following informalities: the dependency of claims 22 and 23 should be changed in accordance to the cancellation of claims 3 and 16 in the amendment filed on March 3, 2003. Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 2674

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 6-7, 9-11, 14, 19-20 and 22-23, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Prior Art, (page 1 through page 4 line 7), hereinafter AAPA.

In reference to claim 1, the AAPA discloses a system for displaying information comprising: a CPU coupled to the bus bridge 103 at first portion; a graphic adaptor 104 couple to the second portion of the bus bridge; a monitor couple to the graphic adaptor; and a serial link from the PC box to the monitor display. The AAPA fails to suggest that the graphic adaptor is localized to the monitor; and a serial link for coupling the first and second portions of the extended bus bridge.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to relocate the graphic adaptor from the PC box to the monitor as desired as was judicially recognized with IN RE JAPIKEE USPQ 70 (CCPA 1950), which recognizes that the relocation of well known element is normally not desired toward patentable subject matter. And it would also been obvious to separate the bus bridge in the AAPA system as desired as was judicially recognized with IN NERWIN V. ERLICHMAN, 168 USPQ 177, 179 (PTO BD. OF INT. 1969), which recognizes that the separation of well known element is normally not desired

Art Unit: 2674

toward patentable subject matter and use the serial link 102 in the AAPA system to connect two portions of the bus together to transfer display data for the system.

In reference to claim 6, the AAPA discloses the cable 102 in Fig 1.

In reference to claim 7, the AAPA discloses that the extended bus bridge is a PCI bus bridge (page 1, line 9) coupled to graphic adaptor.

In reference to claims 9-11 and 22, refer to the rejection as applied to claims 1, 6-7.

In reference to claims 14, 19-20 and 23 are method claims corresponding to the apparatus of claims 1, 6-7, and 9-11; and therefore, rejected based on the same basis set forth in said claims.

7. Claims 8, 12-13 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the AAPA in view of Strongin (U. S. Patent No. 6,304,935).

In reference to claims 8, 12-13 and 21, the AAPA fails to disclose that the at least portion of the extended bridge comprises an Accelerated Graphic Port (AGP) bus bridge coupled to the graphic adaptor. Strongin discloses a portion of a AGP bus bridge 104 coupled to the graphic processor 202 as claimed.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made provide the AGP bus bridge to couple the graphic processor for the system of the AAPA because it would alleviate data bottlenecking for the system (col. 6, lines 1-6).

8. Claims 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the AAPA in view Miyamoto et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6,097,364), hereinafter Miyamoto.

Art Unit: 2674

In reference to claims 24-25 the AAPA fails to disclose that only the information that change is transferred to the display device. Miyamoto discloses a display control apparatus in which only the information that changes is transferred to the display unit (see Fig. 1, col. 5, lines 5-25).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the teaching of Miyamoto for transferring only information that changes to the monitor in the AAPA's device because it would provide a system that could increase the data processing speed by only the updating the changing portion of a screen image.

### ***Response to Arguments***

9. Applicant's arguments, see page 2 of the Amendment, filed on 3/31/03, with respect to newly added claims 24 and 25 have been considered. Claims 24-25 have been rejected in view of the AAPA and newly discovered prior art of Miyamoto. In addition, the rejection for claims 1, 6-14 and 19-25 based on the AAPA in view of Strongin has been maintained for the reason elaborated in this office action.

### ***Conclusion***

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **DUC Q DINH** whose telephone number is **(703) 306-5412**. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 8:00.AM-4:00.PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **RICHARD A HJERPE** can be reached on **(703) 305-4709**.

Art Unit: 2674

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

**Or faxed to:**

**(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)**

Hand-delivery response should be brought to: Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,  
Arlington, Va Sixth Floor (Receptionist)

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding  
should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone  
number is (703) 306-0377.

DUC Q DINH  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2674

DQD  
June 23, 2003



RICHARD WJERPE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600